

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Official Action.

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action

Note is taken of the various grounds of objection and rejection made with respect to the drawings. Submitted herewith are proposed drawing changes marked in red for the Examiner's approval. Formal drawings will be prepared upon the Examiner's approval and the receipt of the Notice of Allowance.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action

Claim 1 has been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

The claims have been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language.

Withdrawal of the objection to claim 1 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action

Claims 2 through 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite.

The above amendments to the claims are believed to clarify the requirements of the rejected claims, especially the particular points identified in the Office Action.

Withdrawal of the §112 rejection of claims 2 through 10 is therefore respectfully requested.

A

Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiefer in view of Zimmerly.

Claim 10 is canceled.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 10 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action

Claims 2,3 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiefer in view of Sutliff.

Claim 2 has been amended to include the details relating to both the manual and automatic actuator. Nowhere in the prior art is there a combination of a manual and automatic actuator like that taught and claimed by applicant. In particular, applicant teaches a "rotary motor" unlike the plunger of Sutliff. Further, applicant teaches an interconnect member which is "eccentrically coupled" to the rotary motor and further connected to an actuator lever which may also be manually biased by way of a pull cord.

Withdrawal of the foregoing §103(a) rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action

Claims 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiefer and Sutliff et al as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Rayfield et al.

With the amendments made to claim 2, such claim is deemed allowable along with claim 4 which depends therefrom.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 4 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 8 of the Office Action

A

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiefer and Sutliff et al as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Cleaveland.

With the amendments made to claim 2, such claim is deemed allowable along with claim 5 which depends therefrom.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 5 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 9 of the Office Action

Claims 7 through 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiefer in view of Sutliff et al as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Tobias.

With the amendments made to claim 2, such claim is deemed allowable along with claims 7 through 9 which depend therefrom.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 7 through 9 is therefore respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Ivar M. Kaardal (Reg. No. 29,812)
KAARDAL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
622 South Minnesota, Suite 1
Sioux Falls, SD 57104-4825
(605)336-9446 FAX (605)336-1931
e-mail patent@kaardal.com

Date: MAY 22 1998

A